

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 19, and 22 being independent.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication on page 5 of the Office Action that claim 22 is allowed and that claims 1-21 and 23-26 would be allowable. For at least the reasons detailed below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims should be considered allowable.

***Claim Objections***

The Examiner objected to claims 1-21 and 23-26 because of minor informalities. Applicants have amended the claims in an effort to correct these minor informalities. In addition, Applicants note that these amendments have not been made to overcome any prior art and therefore, they do not narrow the scope of the claims.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner suggests to insert "profile" after "the desired signal." Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, which clearly recites that sub-sample code phase difference is used to reproduce "a desired signal." Thus, the feature of "the desired signal" in claim 3 has sufficient antecedent basis and should not have been objected to. Similar comments apply to claim 4.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

*Drawings*

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a), stating that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner also provided suggestions on amending Figs. 6-9.

Applicants have amended Figs. 6-9 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a), Applicants respectfully submit that the features of the claims are shown in the drawings such that one skilled in the art would have a proper understanding of the invention.

37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) recites:

The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. However, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box). Emphasis added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that the embodiment of claim 9 is not shown and requests that the drawings specifically show, for example, the feature of "generating in the receive a local clock signal used to provided signal sampling pulses separated by sampling intervals and **to generate other timing signals**," emphasized in Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art can readily determine how to generate other timing signals, and therefore a detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, as required by 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). The same argument applies for the other features of the claims listed by the Examiner. Thus, it should now be clear that the drawings show every feature of the claimed invention such that one skilled in the art would have a proper understanding of the invention.

Accordingly, in view of the above discussion, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

***Conclusion***

In view of the above amendments and remarks, this application appears to be in condition for allowance and the Examiner is, therefore, requested to reexamine the application and pass the claims to issue.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Martin Geissler (Reg. 51,011) at telephone number (703) 205-8000, which is located in the Washington, DC area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

**Date: September 14, 2005**

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Rd

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: Replacement Drawings (Figs. 6-9)

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

Figs. 6-9 have been amended as follows:

Fig. 6: The text “TO CARRIER PHASE INTEGRATION (Fig. 7)” was added to element 34, and the text for element 40 was changed to read “FROM CODE TRACKING LOOP (Fig. 7);

Fig. 7: The text “TO CODE PHASE ADJUST (Fig. 6)” was added to element 40;

Fig. 8: The text “TO CARRIER PHASE INTEGRATION (Fig. 9)” was added to element 34, and the text for element 40 was changed to read “FROM CODE TRACKING LOOP (Fig. 9); and

Fig. 9: The text “TO CODE PHASE ADJUST (Fig. 8)” was added to element 40.